

REMARKS CONCERNING THE AMENDMENTS

The only amendment presented above was to place claim 13 into condition for allowance by combining the limitations of claim 13 with the limitations of claim 10. The Office Action had indicated that this would place claim 14 in condition for allowance. Claims 14 and 20-21 were previously dependent from claim 13 or ultimately dependent from claim 13, and are therefore also allowable. Claims 15 and 17-19 have been made dependent from claim 13. No further search is needed for consideration of this amendment, no additional claims have been added, and no new issues have been presented. The amendment is therefore *prima facie* in condition for entry and should not be refused.

SUMMARY OF THE OFFICE ACTION

Claims 1-3, 5, 23-25 and 27 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by the Potter reference (US Patent No. 5,697,614).

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by the Jones et al. reference (U.S. Patent No. 4,861,041, Caribbean Stud® poker).

Claims 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over the Jones et al. reference.

Claims 4, 10, 11 and 15-19 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Potter in view of Hedman (U.S. Patent No. 5,678,821).

Claim 12 has have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Potter in view of Hedman (U.S. Patent No. 5,678,821) in further view of Lott (U.S. Patent No. 5,851,011).

Claims 6, 14, 20 and 21 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Potter in view of Hedman (U.S. Patent No. 5,678,821, cited by the PTO) and further in view of Jones et al.

SUMMARY OF THE OFFICE ACTION

Claims 1-3, 5, 23-25 and 27 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by the Potter reference (US Patent No. 5,697,614).

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by the Jones et al. reference (U.S. Patent No. 4,861,041, Caribbean Stud® poker).

Claims 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over the Jones et al. reference.

Claims 4, 10, 11 and 15-19 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Potter in view of Hedman (U.S. Patent No. 5,678,821).

Claim 12 has have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Potter in view of Hedman (U.S. Patent No. 5,678,821) in further view of Lott (U.S. Patent No. 5,851,011).

Claims 6, 14, 20 and 21 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Potter in view of Hedman (U.S. Patent No. 5,678,821, cited by the PTO) and further in view of Jones et al.

RESPONSE TO THE REJECTIONS

All rejections have been rendered moot by placing claim 13 into condition for allowance and making all remaining claims dependent from claim 13.

CONCLUSION

The rejections of record have been overcome by cancellation and/or amendment. The rejections are moot and all claims should be allowed. If the Examiner believes that minor issues may be resolved by direct telephone correspondence with the attorney of record, the Examiner is courteously invited to call the attorney of record at **952.832.9090** during conventional Central Standard Time business hours.

Respectfully submitted,

ROGER M. SNOW

By His/Their Representatives,

MARK A. LITMAN & ASSOCIATES, P.A.

York Business Center, Suite 205

3209 West 76th Street

Edina, Minnesota 55435

(952) 832-9090

Date: JANUARY 24, 2005

By: 

Mark A. Litman

Reg. No. 26,390